



Application No: 09/677,493


Appl. No: 2009-1164

Filing Date: 10/02/2000

Application Title: "Integrated Database Data Editing System"

Applicant: George Guang Yang (Previous used name: Guang Yang)

Examiner: Baoquoc N. To, Art Unit 2162



August 2, 2010

392 Hans Way
San Jose, CA 95133
Tel: (408) 729-1282

E-mail: guangyang14@hotmail.com

Mr. Baoquoc N. To
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Statement of the Substance of the Interview

Dear Mr. To,

This letter is to reply to your "Interview Summary" mailed to me on July 30, 2010. As I always insist, the amended specification and original Claims 1-7 mailed to you on June 24, 2010 and filed in your office on June 28, 2010 have complied with 37 CFR 1.312 and is the final amendment of my patent application. I only made some minor amendment to the specification but I did not add any new matter. The amendment makes my statement more clear, precise and specific but not broaden or shrink any element. I believe that the Claims 1-7 structure and dependent relationship is the best way to show the value of this invention. My Claims 1-7 should be allowed by your office as soon as possible.

I mailed the Issue Fee \$755 to the "Mail Stop ISSUE FEE" and a letter on July 28, 2010 to reply to your "Response to Rule 312 Communication" mailed to me on July 20, 2010. I sent you a letter on June 29, 2010 to reply to your "Response to Rule 312 Communication" mailed to me on June 22, 2010. I sent you a letter and the clean version and marked version of the amended specification of my patent application with original Claims 1-7 and an electric floppy disk with the clean version files on June 24, 2010.

I sent you a letter on May 21, 2010 to reply your “Notice of Allowability” mailed to me on May 17, 2010. I am glad to learn that “All claims being allowable” as you stated. I sent the “Statement of the Substance of the Interview” to you on May 17, 2010 to response to your “Interview Summary” mailed to me on May 13, 2010. I sent my “Reply to ‘Office Communication’ and Request to Allow Claims 1-7” to your office on April 27, 2010 to reply your “Office Communication” mailed to me on April 15, 2010. I mailed the “Request for Reopen Prosecution before Examiner on the Decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences” under 37 CFR § 41.77(b)(1) to your office on February 7, 2010 and on September 27, 2009, which stated enough factual merits and legal bases to oppose the Board’s decision to sustain your rejection of Claims 1 & 3.

My patent application is very significant in both technology and economy fields. As the fact shows that delaying my patent approval has also deterred our “Hi-Tech” industry in the past ten years. It has consumed ten years of my precious productive life now and ruined my career and my personal life. I require your office to approve my amended specification and Claims 1-7 as soon as possible. Once my patent is granted, I will apply for the venture capital funds to implement it as commercial software products to contribute to our society.

Sincerely,



George Guang Yang, Ph.D.

Independent Inventor